

# COMMISSION CONFERENCE

## JUNE 20, 2000

### Agenda

<u>Item</u>	<u>Page</u>
I-A	Hoisting and Mooring of Boats in the Waterways ..... 9
I-B	Permitted Use Change and Amendments to the Unified Land Development Regulations (ULDR) – Barrier Island Zoning Districts ..... 1
I-C	2000 State Legislative Session (Deferred) ..... 13
I-D	Policy – Speed Humps on Collector Roads ..... 13
I-E	East Las Olas Boulevard Community Transportation Plan ..... 14
I-F	1999 Uniform Crime Report (Deferred) ..... 19
I-G	Ordinance No. C-99-18/ULDR Section 47-19.5 – Fences, Walls and Hedges (See Regular Meeting) ..... 19
I-J	High-Speed Broadband Services ..... 19
I-K	Bethune-Cookman College – Annual South Florida Classic Football Weekend Event ..... 19
II-A	Creation of Subcommittee – Parks, Recreation & Beaches Advisory Board – Procedural Guide ..... 19
II-B	City Commission Staff Resources (Deferred) ..... 20
III-B	Advisory Board Vacancies: 1. Aviation Advisory Board ..... 20 2. Budget Advisory Board (Deferred) ..... 20 3. Civil Service Board (Deferred) ..... 20 4. Community Appearance Board ..... 20 5. Education Advisory Board ..... 20 6. Historic Preservation Board (Deferred) ..... 20 7. Marine Advisory Board (Deferred) ..... 20 8. Parks, Recreation & Beaches Advisory Board (Deferred) ..... 20 9. Planning & Zoning Board ..... 20 10. Unsafe Structures & Housing Appeals Board (Deferred) ..... 20 11. Fort Lauderdale Housing Authority ..... 21
IV	City Commission Reports (Deferred) ..... 21
V	City Manager Reports (Deferred) ..... 21

**COMMISSION CONFERENCE**

**2:02 P.M.**

**JUNE 20, 2000**

Present: Mayor Naugle  
Commissioners Hutchinson, Katz, Moore and Smith

Also Present: City Manager, City Attorney, City Clerk and Police Sergeant

**I-B – Permitted Use Change and Amendments to the  
Unified Land Development Regulations (ULDR) –  
Barrier Island Zoning Districts**

A discussion was scheduled about a proposal for permitted use changes to the PRD, ABA, IOA, SBMHA, NBRA and SLA zoning districts and other amendments to the ULDR effecting the Barrier Island zoning districts and the RMH, RML and CB zoning districts lying east of the Intracoastal Waterway. Notice of the public discussion was published on June 13, 2000.

Mr. Chris Wren, Manager, Office of Community and Comprehensive Planning, stated that these amendments related to the barrier island zoning districts, and a report had been distributed resulting from Barrier Island Committee workshops. He pointed out that a list of consensus recommendations was included in the back-up material as Exhibit 2. Mr. Wren advised they were divided into three categories – proposed Code Changes; Proposed Code Changes Zoning in Progress for Community Business Zoning District; and Numerical Studies.

Mr. Wren advised that if the Commission approved, the proposed amendments would be presented to the Planning & Zoning Board and the City Commission for formal public hearings. He noted that the Commission had the ability to create Zoning in Progress today, and the four recommendations focused primarily on the Community Business District because these areas had not yet been fully studied. Nevertheless, the Committee felt these four items were necessary to properly regulate density and development issues. Mr. Wren added that there were also two additional Zoning in Progress issues dealing with the Central Beach Area ABA and PRD as to building lengths, and the Commission had indicated it might wish to discuss that further.

Mr. Wren stated the numerical studies had been requested by the Committee in order to develop statistical criteria addressing view protection, neighborhood compatibility, and protect against over development. He recommended that the City hire a consultant on these nine items to help generate those numerical studies and three-dimensional computer models in order to envision how these things would affect surrounding properties.

At 2:05 P.M., Commissioner Moore left the meeting.

Commissioner Katz referred to the three-dimensional model. She asked if that would be done for each project. Mr. Wren stated that the Commission had asked staff to examine the idea of requiring three-dimensional models for development review, and Ms. Hollar had indicated they currently followed that practice. In this case, the consultant could develop some models to demonstrate how the different recommendations would affect properties. He used item 3 (study to allow greater height to achieve wider side yards in IOA) as an example.

*Ms. Mildred Cohen* cared a lot about the beach and about Fort Lauderdale, in general. She was afraid that changing zoning laws would do more harm than good. Ms. Cohen said she was here to protest the proposal for a hotel on East Sunrise Boulevard. Mayor Naugle noted that the issue today was the overall zoning for the beach and the City, but not any specific project. Therefore, the proposal involving the Franco & Vinny's Pizza Shack property was not on the agenda, although it would be affected by the overall zoning regulations. Commissioner Smith believed there was only one possible aspect of the entire document that would have anything to do with whether or not the developer could build the hotel. That issue related to the setback in the SLA.

*Mr. Jess Moore*, representing the Carlton Towers, complimented the City Commission for its decision on L'Ambiance and supported the Central Beach Alliance in its zoning objectives. He felt there were already enough high rise buildings in the SLA district, and he felt the City Commission should promote low and medium-rise development. Mr. Moore said there was only one item concerning the SLA, which pertained to childcare centers, and he heartily endorsed that recommendation.

Mayor Naugle suggested that staff explain the public hearing process that would be followed if a large development was proposed for the Franco & Vinny's site. Mr. Wren noted that DRC agendas were distributed to all registered homeowners' associations, so he wanted to ensure that Carlton Towers was registered. As to the process, he explained that a large building would require a Level IV review through the DRC, and then there would be formal public hearings before the Planning & Zoning Board and the City Commission.

Ms. Cohen stated that Sunrise Boulevard was one of the main access routes to the beach, and she felt it should be beautified with proper walkways, shade trees, flowers, shrubs and benches. That required a certain width, and many of the pedestrians were senior citizens who enjoyed the view from the bridge. She pointed out that traffic was already horrendous, and she preferred shops, restaurants and town homes rather than very large buildings that took too much space and created greater congestion.

At 2:15 P.M., Commissioner Moore returned to the meeting.

*Ms. Randi Taylor*, 722 Intracoastal Drive, said she was representing the Sunrise Intracoastal Association. She stated that the IOA was next to the Sunrise Intracoastal neighborhood, and the residents did not want to see development of 15 story buildings with 20' setbacks.

*Mr. John Street*, Central Beach Alliance, approved of all eleven proposed changes. However, there were some concerns about freestanding restaurants because of the additional traffic they would generate and the waste disposal problems associated with those uses. He was also concerned that the Intracoastal lot might become a satellite to a hotel on the ocean and compound the dock and hoist problems the City was facing along the Intracoastal Waterway.

Mr. Street concurred with the four recommended zoning in progress issues, and he stated that the 200' building limit was very important to the Central Beach Alliance. He felt this would help reduce the mass of buildings a little bit in the beach area. Mr. Street said there were concerns about the north/south direction, but the Alliance really wished no exceptions would be made in the east/west direction. He was also supportive of a study relating to floor area ratios and lot coverage.

*Ms. Shirley Smith*, member of the Beach Redevelopment Board, felt the beach was of paramount importance now and into the future. She pointed out that millions of dollars had been invested in the beach area, and she felt the City should mandate adequate setbacks so there could be functional landscaping for strolling. Ms. Smith felt A-1-A should be made into a "people street" with 20' sidewalks. She hoped the new Code would encourage new construction with responsible outcomes.

*Mr. Bob Reynolds* was concerned about back out parking in the beach area. He pointed out that probably 75% of the establishments in the beach area had existing back-out parking, and he felt that should be grandfathered in so they could rebuild in the event of a storm. Mr. Reynolds did not believe there was anything in writing that would allow rebuilding after a catastrophic storm, and he felt there should be such an ordinance.

Mayor Naugle thought Mr. Reynolds had raised an interesting point. He believed it might be necessary to recognize that back-out parking was not that bad unless the street was a major thoroughfare, particularly in areas with mixed residential/office uses. Mayor Naugle agreed this was very prevalent in the beach area and could be something everyone would have to live with, or perhaps the Commission could make a decision in this regard if there were a serious storm. Commissioner Smith agreed he had been raising that question about rebuilding, and most people felt they should have the right to rebuild their properties.

*Mr. Gary Sieger*, North Beach Island Alliance, supported the eleven proposed Code changes, and the four zoning in progress issues. However, he had concerns about items 2, 4, 7 and 8 with respect to the numerical studies proposed. He felt the moratorium had gone on for too long and should be concluded. As to item 2 related to lot coverage, Mr. Sieger recalled a Section in the 1994 Code in this regard, and it simply said that the taller the building, the greater the setbacks. Unfortunately, that Section had been repealed, and there was consensus from the Committee to replace that language.

Mr. Sieger referred to item 4. He stated that one issue of debate was whether the community wanted taller buildings with wider setbacks or shorter buildings with more narrow setbacks. Mr. Sieger stated that if a development requested a height of more than 150' in the North Beach area, it should be presented as a conditional use with criteria that had to be met. For example, he felt any building taller than 150' should have a setback of half the height of the building without exception. This would provide a criteria for increasing the height and increase the green space around the building. Mr. Sieger felt an alternative to that would be strictly limiting building height, and he could support either approach.

Mr. Sieger stated that item 7 pertained to yard modifications, and he felt there should be a minimum yard dimension below which no project could go, such as 50'. He pointed out that some people felt the minimum should be 25', but staff should be directed today to include an absolute minimum yard. Mr. Sieger said the RMH-60 district was right across the street from low-density residential property, and he felt there should be a buffer zoning district. In the absence of such a district, he suggested that no yard modifications be allowed on properties facing residential properties so there would always be a yard of at least half the height of the building.

*Ms. Miranda Lopez*, North Beach Island Alliance and Dolphin Isles, was willing to accept Commissioner Smith's proposal with an absolute maximum building height of 150' with yards provided adjacent to single-family residences. She felt neighborhood compatibility required side yards, and she supported the position of the Central Beach Alliance. Ms. Lopez suggested that if a developer wanted a yard of less than 50', it could be reduced to no less than 25' as long as other criteria were met.

*Mr. Marvin Sanders* said he had served on the Planning & Zoning Board for eleven years, and it was his personal opinion that developers and neighborhoods needed to know specific numbers so they understood what the Code required right from the start. He noted that there had been discussion about an architectural appeals board, but it had never been formed. It was Mr. Sanders' position that very clear and specific numbers were essential in terms of height, yards, and dimension. He understood there was a lot of support for the 200' building limit, and he thought that could be modified to allow for the sum of the total dimensions. He believed that tall narrow buildings were much less intrusive than short, squat buildings.

Commissioner Smith stated that there were some people who had recently moved into the beach area, and he had been receiving messages complaining about making buildings bigger and closer together. He thought everyone had been working on this issue for over two years, and he believed this action would take a new direction to bring shorter buildings with greater setbacks and landscaping. Commissioner Smith wanted to make sure no one thought the Commission was going in the other direction.

Commissioner Smith referred to the SLA district. He stated that Franco & Vinny's was built right up to the sidewalk, so there was a legal, non-conforming use. Commissioner Smith did not think it was a good idea to have restaurants set back 20' from sidewalks, and he proposed a lesser setback contingent on construction of a mid-rise building in the SLA. He suggested allowing up to a 0' setback in the SLA as long as the building was 80' tall or less.

Commissioner Smith agreed with items one through eleven as submitted by this committee of citizens except item eight calling for no exception to the beach shadow restriction in PRD. He did not feel there should be any exceptions to the beach shadow restriction anywhere on the barrier island. He advised that the ordinance did not allow the beach to be shadowed at the equinox until after 3:00 P.M., but he had received photographs showing the beach shadowed behind The Palms.

Mayor Naugle stated that The Palms had not conformed with the beach shadow ordinance. He felt a corrupt administration had allowed The Palms to use a building next door for doing the measurements as to shadow. He said that project had been developed at a time when the administration had recommended approval of items that did not conform with the Code. Commissioner Smith asked that a memorandum explaining how The Palms had indicated compliance would be achieved so he could send it to the citizens who raised questions.

Commissioner Katz said she had done some research with regard to the shadow ordinance, and she had been told that private beach was not counted. She had thought all of the beach was public, but apparently there were some private beach areas. Commissioner Smith stated the beach was public up to the high water mark, but there was some private beach between buildings and the high water mark.

Mayor Naugle asked if the Commission could agree there would be no exceptions to the shadow ordinance on the barrier island and establish zoning in progress at this point. The City Attorney replied it could take that action. Commissioner Moore noted that there were already tall buildings in the area, and he wondered what the concern was, particularly since he did not know what would be affected by such a rule. Commissioner Smith felt there were too many buildings jammed into a four-block area. He believed there were already enough high rises in the area.

Commissioner Moore asked if there were concerns about the Burt Harris Act when trying to reduce density. The City Attorney agreed that issue would have to be addressed as plans moved forward. Mr. Wren noted that an ordinance had recently been adopted that allowed someone to request a yard of less than 20', but it would have to go through the DRC, the Planning & Zoning Board and the City Commission. Now, he understood the Commission wanted to go back to requiring 20' unless the height was no more than 80'. Mr. Wren was not a lawyer and did not know about all the implications that might have on the properties involved.

The City Attorney stated that someone could currently construct a 150' tall building, with mechanisms that would allow less than the required setback in return for a reduction in height. He explained that it would all come down to whether or not building plans were overly burdened by new governmental regulations. The City Attorney stated that law was still being crafted in this regard in the appellate courts, and it would be some time before he could predict the outcome with any certainty.

Mayor Naugle noted that there was a hearing going on right now at the Broward County Courthouse about a similar issue involving Smoker Park. The City Attorney agreed that was true. Commissioner Smith thought this was a fairly simple issue because this property owner did not have this absolute right now. There had been a legal, non-conforming use, but there had been no right until recently to construct a tall building. He understood there was now a conditional right to have a 10' setback under certain circumstances.

The City Attorney noted that the Harris Act did not apply to temporary measures that restricted building rights, and zoning in progress was temporary by its nature, while permanent measures were under consideration.

Commissioner Moore was concerned that a six-month moratorium had continued for such a long time. Commissioner Smith agreed with Mr. Sanders. He felt it was time to end the moratorium and adopt hard numbers. Mayor Naugle did not feel there had been a true moratorium. Rather, there had just been zoning in progress established as to maximum sized buildings. Commissioner Smith believed there had been a real moratorium for six months, but it had never been formally ended so property owners had no certainty as to what the rules would be and could not move forward.

Mayor Naugle believed staff would need time to formulate the numbers and the language that would be defensible. The City Manager agreed it would take at least a few weeks to finalize the numbers. Commissioner Moore thought hard and fast numbers should be developed by staff and not sitting here at this table today because the impact on properties would have to be examined. Mayor Naugle noted that any ordinance required two readings and had to be defensible.

Commissioner Smith referred to zoning in progress for the community business area north of Oakland Park Boulevard on the west side of the street. He felt the first recommendation calling for no more than 25 units per acre should just be implemented now without any further study or zoning in progress. Commissioner Katz said she would prefer a little time to examine the effect of such a proposal. Mayor Naugle suggested that the City Manager be asked to recommend what could be implemented in short order, with the understanding that some things might take longer. He wanted to make sure it was done correctly. It was agreed. Commissioner Smith also wanted an ordinance prepared right away with regard to application of design guidelines, additional shade trees and minimum 10' sidewalks.

Commissioner Smith referred to the numerical studies to change the definition of floor area ratio. He felt that issue had been studied enough, and it had been under discussion for three years. He thought the ratio could be kept the same as it was today with the inclusion of garages. Commissioner Moore differed with Commissioner Smith in that respect. Commissioner Smith was not convinced that the old provision about lot coverage should be replaced in the Code because that seemed too restrictive.

Commissioner Hutchinson wondered why that provision had been removed. Commissioner Smith recalled that in order to build the tallest building allowed on the beach, a developer could only cover 50% of the lot, and he felt that was just too restrictive. Mayor Naugle understood the recommendation was to replace that provision but to revise the percentages based on a study. Commissioner Smith supported that recommendation.

Commissioner Smith disagreed with the recommendation to study the idea of allowing greater heights in order to achieve wider side yards in the IOA. He thought the setbacks should be changed from 10' to 20' today. Commissioner Smith pointed out that would leave at least 40' between buildings. Commissioner Moore understood the idea was to allow no exceptions to those setback requirements even if a two-story building was proposed. Mayor Naugle felt setbacks should be half the height of a building. Commissioner Smith did not care for that type of regulation. He believed the citizenry preferred a set minimum setback. He also preferred a building height limitation of 120'.

Mayor Naugle understood Commissioner Smith wanted to allow 120' tall buildings straight up with a 20' setback. Commissioner Smith agreed that was correct. He said his intent was to not provide incentives for large buildings at the beach while providing incentives in town where it was appropriate. Commissioner Smith understood it would make it harder to build in the beach area, but redevelopment was needed elsewhere in Fort Lauderdale.

Mayor Naugle believed there was a developer planning a six- or eight-story building along the Intracoastal Waterway, and he would now be able to build to a height of 120' with a 20' setback under the "Smith Amendments." Commissioner Smith did not think that would happen. Mayor Naugle was sure that if there were set side yards and set heights, that's what developers would build. He did not think that was desirable and preferred the recommendation as stated to study the idea of allowing greater height in order to achieve wider side yards in the IOA. Mayor Naugle wanted to get away from the "wedding cake" effect because that resulted in the lower floors being used for parking.

Commissioner Moore was concerned about trying to set firm rules during this discussion because the Commission did not know what the overall effects would be at this time. While he agreed that a 20' setback seemed reasonable, he felt a regulation should have a stated purpose. Commissioner Moore pointed out that someone could build a single-story building now with a 10' setback, and he did not think that was undesirable. He believed the goal was to prevent a canyon affect.

Commissioner Smith wanted to change the current 10' minimum setback today. Mayor Naugle felt the setback had to be considered in relation to the height of a building. Commissioner Moore agreed. Mayor Naugle did not think anyone wanted 120' tall buildings extending straight upward even if they were 20' from the property line. He thought a formula should be developed that allowed taller buildings as long as the setbacks increased along with the height. Mayor Naugle agreed a 10' setback might be appropriate for a one-story building. Commissioner Smith did not think anyone would construct a single-story structure. He also thought a 120' building might need a 60' setback at the ground. Commissioner Moore suggested the Commission ask staff to consider setbacks of 10' with heights of up to 50' and await further recommendations. Commissioner Katz agreed staff should be given time to examine the suggestions and provide recommendations.

At 3:15 P.M., Commissioner Moore left the meeting.

Mayor Naugle did not support the idea of allowing greater heights, but he did want to hear more about side yards with a minimum width of 20' if a building was over three stories.

Commissioner Smith believed people were tired of the Commission taking everything under advisement, sending everything to committees for further study, and never making a decision. He believed the next page of consensus recommendations involved the North Beach, and everything involved a study. Therefore, it appeared to him that nothing would change in that area either despite major land assemblages. Commissioner Smith was concerned that people would find a way to construct buildings in the area before any changes to the Code were made.

Commissioner Smith understood the RMH-60 only allowed heights of up to 150' with a 20' setback under today's Code. He felt the setback requirement should be increased to 25' on the sides and 50' on the front, along with reducing the maximum height to 120'. Commissioner Smith felt that would be a reasonable approach to preventing construction of buildings that would loom over the nearby single-family residences. He believed it would also allow for more appropriate construction in an area that was already over-built.

Mayor Naugle referred to the area north of Oakland Park Boulevard. He noted that pushing the buildings back at the front would push them closer to the residential homes at the rear. He did not understand why Commissioner Smith would want to consider that idea. Commissioner Smith acknowledged he could be right, and he was not sure how this would apply in that area. Mayor Naugle pointed out it was still on the barrier island, and he felt the side abutting residential should have the greater setback.

At 3:18 P.M., Commissioner Moore returned to the meeting.



Commissioner Smith said he would defer to the District Commissioner as to the area north of Oakland Park Boulevard, but he represented the area south of Oakland Park Boulevard to 19<sup>th</sup> Street. It was a very small area and almost built-out. Mayor Naugle asked what he would suggest for rear setbacks. Commissioner Smith felt 50' would be appropriate. Commissioner Moore understood he was referring to the area west of A-1-A, south of Oakland Park Boulevard. Commissioner Smith agreed that was correct.

Mr. Wren advised that the RMH-60 area allowed heights of up to 300', with the 150' serving as a trigger for the different types of review processes and additional criteria. Commissioner Smith understood that property owners did not have the absolute right to build up to 300'. Rather, they could only build over 150' with review and approval. Mr. Wren agreed that was correct. He asked Commissioner Smith if he was suggesting these requirements be removed from the Code and a maximum height of 120' only be allowed in the district. Commissioner Smith agreed that was his suggestion. Mr. Wren advised a specialized study would have to be conducted because only the RMH-60 Citywide had been considered.

Commissioner Smith agreed with the speakers about back out parking in the NBRA district. He thought allowing that was something the Commission should consider. Mayor Naugle pointed out that there were differences between Bayshore Drive and Birch Road and the side streets. He agreed that back-out parking would not be the "end of the world" in some instances on side streets, but he thought it was a problem on Bayshore Drive and Birch Road, although Bayshore Drive was wide. Mayor Naugle preferred that the City Commission consider allowing back-out parking when properties were being rebuilt after a storm.

Commissioner Smith thought it would be better to include grandfathering in existing back-out parking in the Code of Ordinances today so people would know if they could rebuild after a storm or not. Commissioner Katz thought there might be State laws to consider when it came to rebuilding after a major storm. The City Attorney agreed to research whether or not the State could prohibit the City from grandfathering in certain situations after a storm. He was not prepared today to discuss the impact State law might have in this regard. Commissioner Smith felt the ability to negotiate as to property rights had to be removed from the Code. He thought everyone would be willing to live with something less if they were guaranteed certain rights under the Code without lobbying and negotiating.

Commissioner Smith had no objection to studying view corridors as outlined in item five, but he did not support the sixth item of study. He explained that he did not want to see buildings with heights greater than 125', so he saw no need for such a study. Mayor Naugle believed greater heights were allowed now. Mr. Wren agreed the CB zoning allowed heights of 150', and the committee had been trying to create a more regulated environment when buildings over 125' were proposed. Therefore, this would represent a greater restriction than currently existed. Commissioner Smith was persuaded that the sixth recommendation should be implemented.

Commissioner Smith believed the seventh item related to Ms. Lopez's remarks earlier. He explained that the residents wanted 50' setbacks all the way around and, if the setback on one side was reduced to 25', that space had to be replaced elsewhere. He felt that was too restrictive and believed 25' side yards and 50' front and rear yards would be reasonable. Commissioner Smith felt the setbacks should be increased without further study between Oakland Park Boulevard and 19<sup>th</sup> Avenue. Mayor Naugle believed this would have to be studied, but he thought staff could expedite the matter after determining if one area within a zoning district could be addressed separately from the rest. Commissioner Smith believed the Planning & Zoning Board "spot zoned" all the time.

It was the consensus of the Commission that there was no need to study yard modifications (item 8). Commissioner Smith did not feel people should be able to negotiate the size of the yards, and there should be an absolute requirement. He referred to studying the calculation of height (item 9). Commissioner Smith saw no need to study this further. He preferred to define the ceiling of the highest unit as the height of the building without including air conditioners on the roof. Commissioner Moore understood the height would relate to the building itself without considering anything on the roof. Mayor Naugle thought fixtures on the roof should be screened as necessary, but he did not think 100' architectural embellishment would be in order.

Mr. Wren summarized his understanding of the Commission's directions as to the Numerical Studies recommended by the committee:

1. Include garages in floor area calculations for all uses;
2. Study as recommended;
3. Study 20' minimum side yards with building heights greater than 3 stories in the IOA;
4. Study RMH-60 with 25' side yards, 50' front and rear yards and 120' heights, and provide recommendations;
5. Study as recommended;
6. Study as recommended;
7. Study and provide recommendations similar to Item 4;
8. Delete from list; and
9. Study as recommended.

Mr. Wren noted that everything would be reviewed by the City Attorney's Office to ensure legal issues were addressed.

**Action:** As discussed.

At 3:35 P.M., the meeting was recessed. It was reconvened at 3:48 P.M. Commissioner Moore did not return at that time.

### **I-A – Hoisting and Mooring of Boats in the Waterways**

A discussion was scheduled on a proposal for the maximum height of a vessel hoisted above a waterway; the waiver criteria for hoisting and mooring of boats; the extension of docks and other structures into the waterway; the setback requirements for hoisting devices; and, the number of mooring devices that could be located on a property. Notice of the public discussion was published on June 10, 2000.

Mr. Romeo Lavarias, Planner III, recalled that when the Zoning Code had been updated a few years ago, staff had talked with many homeowners' associations about their concerns, and this subject had been included on the "To Do List," now known as the "Pending Items List." He advised that hiring a consultant for certain issues had been considered, but staff had proposed some recommendations in this regard.

Ms. Christine Fisher, Planner I, stated that the issue of boat hoists and mooring structures had arisen due to community concerns about aesthetics because newer devices allowed larger, and larger boats to be hoisted into the air. The City Commission had subsequently directed staff to address concerns that the current limitation on the number of boatlifts allowed was too restrictive. Therefore, staff had tried to come up with a compromise that allowed additional boatlifts while taking aesthetics into consideration.

At 3:50 P.M., Commissioner Moore returned to the meeting.

Ms. Fisher reported that staff had analyzed the Codes in other communities, and the comparative analysis data had been distributed to the City Commission with the back-up material. Staff had also done some mapping and analyzed databases and case law. Ms. Fisher compared the existing regulations to the regulations recommended by staff on the basis of their research, as detailed in Memorandum No. 00-0738. Those recommendations fell into the categories of:

- modifications to the number of mooring devices;
- modifications to the side yard setback requirements;
- modifications to the maximum extension of devices into the waterway; and
- modifications to the maximum height to which a vessel could be hoisted.

Ms. Fisher explained that existing regulations allowed 1 hoist or mooring device per 100' of lot width or portion thereof. For each additional 100' of lot width, an additional mooring device was permitted. Staff recommended that 1 device be allowed for the first 100' of lot width or portion thereof and 1 additional device be allowed for each additional 100' of lot width or portion thereof. She noted that it was also recommended that the City Commission have the ability to waive these limitations subsequent to public hearing and notification. Therefore, a lot with 200' of width would be allowed 2 hoists.

Ms. Fisher stated that watercraft currently could not extend beyond the side setbacks required in the zoning district, and accessory structures had to conform to side yard restrictions for residential buildings in the district. Staff recommended that side yard setbacks be established as follows, unless the setbacks of the zoning districts were greater:

- 10' if the waterway frontage was less than or equal to 75';
- 15' if the waterway frontage was greater than 75' up to and including 90';
- 20' if the waterway frontage was greater than 90' up to and including 100'; and
- 25' if the waterway frontage was greater than 100' in width.

Ms. Fisher explained these setback requirements would move vessels toward the centers of properties in order to provide greater view corridors from adjacent properties. She also noted that if the setbacks of the zoning districts were greater, the greater setback would apply.

Ms. Fisher stated current regulations did not permit the keel of any boat to be hoisted more than 1' above the seawall. In addition, the cross section of any davit, hoist, lift, etc. could not exceed 1 square foot at a height of 6-1/2' above lot grade. Staff recommended that the keel of any boat (or, in the absence of a keel, the "deepest point of a vessel") not be hoisted more than the elevation permitted by a dock per Section 47-19.3(E). Staff also recommended deletion of the term "above lot grade" from Section 47-19.3(A) regarding the height of davits, hoists or other structures.

Ms. Fisher reported that current regulations allowed mooring structures to extend into or over the waterway no more than 5' beyond the property line where the waterway was less than or equal to 50' in width. Where the waterway exceeded 50', docks and slips could not extend more than 10% of the width of the waterway or a maximum of 20', whichever was smaller, as measured from the property line. She noted that the City Commission could currently waive these limitations subsequent to public and notification. Staff recommended that where waterways were 60' or less in width, mooring devices not be permitted to extend more than 5' beyond the property line. Where waterways exceeded 60' in width, staff recommended that mooring structures not be allowed to extend more than 20% of the width or a maximum of 20', whichever was smaller, as measured from the property line. Ms. Fisher advised that staff recommended retaining the City Commission's ability to waive these limitations.

Ms. Fisher stated that under current regulations, the City Commission could grant waivers of limitations under "extraordinary circumstances" after public hearing and notification of property owners within 300'. Staff proposed that more meaningful waiver criteria be established, such as:

- the impact or lack thereof of navigation;
- the necessity for the structure or mooring device (due to either the size of the vessels, water depths, tidal conditions, or excessive wave action); and
- neighborhood compatibility, including the presence or lack thereof at surrounding properties of similar structures exceeding the limitations.

Ms. Fisher stated that these recommendations had been presented to the Marine Advisory Board for review on May 4, 2000, and they had endorsed the recommendations in concept. The Board had also recommended that the City retain a marine consultant to further refine the issues and study the effects of the proposed ordinance on mixed use, multi-family, and single-family zoning districts. The Board had also requested that if the Commission did not care to retain a consultant, this matter be sent back to the Board for further recommendations.

Ms. Fisher advised that since the Board had reviewed this issue, staff had conducted some additional research to address some of its concerns. She provided some additional written materials and displayed an aerial photograph showing a waterway width of 60' and a 75' lot. Under the recommendation, there would be 10' side setbacks, and extension of the mooring device into the waterway could not exceed 5'. She advised that a vessel could extend 18' into this 60' waterway. Ms. Fisher displayed several more illustrations, noting that the recommended Code modifications would push vessels toward the center of the properties where they were moored.

Ms. Fisher explained that staff's recommendations pertained to the hoists themselves rather than the vessels because the permit process would provide a mechanism for regulation. Commissioner Smith asked Ms. Fisher if she had any photographs of the different lift mechanisms available. Ms. Fisher said she had learned from the marine industry that there were many different types of lifts.

Mayor Naugle understood a boat could not be lifted higher than the dock. Ms. Fisher agreed that was the recommendation. Mayor Naugle noted that property owners sometime swung their boats back over the land, which would not be possible with this height limitation. Mr. Chris Wren, Manager of Comprehensive and Community Planning, thought a modification could be made so a boat could be hoisted over land. He stated that the whole intent was to protect views, so moving a boat over land would satisfy that intent, and perhaps that should be allowed.

Mayor Naugle asked if the propeller, shafts and struts were considered the bottom of a boat. Ms. Fisher advised that the exact language would be worked out for an ordinance but, at this point, the deepest point of the boat would be considered the bottom. Mr. Lavarias said that staff had worked with the marine industry, and different types of boats had different bottoms. He advised that staff would continue to seek some commonality that could be used for the definition.

Commissioner Moore understood the height to which vessels were hoisted was the problem, so he did not understand how allowing them to be hoisted above the dock level would achieve the goal. Ms. Fisher believed the concerns had related to views from adjacent property. Commissioner Katz suggested boats be allowed to be lifted 1' above the highest water line rather than the dock level. Mayor Naugle thought that would be acceptable, unless boats were hoisted over land.

Commissioner Katz pointed out that many people had docks that were extensions of their patios and, as a result, were very high. Mayor Naugle did not think those were legal. Commissioner Katz acknowledged that could be true, but there were a lot of them in Fort Lauderdale. Ms. Fisher stated the measurement would relate to the legally permitted dock as opposed to the actual dock.

Mayor Naugle believed people had hoists for two reasons – to protect the bottoms of their boats or for safe dockage in rough areas. However, they also had to tie their boats up to move them on and off the davits. He believed that pushing the hoists towards the center of the property would make it difficult to have davits at all because it would eliminate the area for the dock. Mayor Naugle explained that there would not be enough space for a vessel when it was not on the davit. He thought that might still be what everyone wanted, but it was a concern. Mayor Naugle stated the reason davits were usually placed at the edge of properties was to leave space to tie up while embarking and disembarking. He drew a diagram to illustrate his point.

Commissioner Smith wondered if Mayor Naugle thought a lesser setback than 25' would be in order. Mayor Naugle suggested a 20' setback. Commissioner Moore was unclear as to the problem. Commissioner Smith believed someone would have to tie up his boat in front of a neighbor's property while getting the lift device ready. Commissioner Moore understood that, but the boat would not be left there for any amount of time. Mayor Naugle pointed out that the neighbor might have a boat behind his property as well.

Commissioner Katz noted that Mayor Naugle was discussing one issue, and she felt consideration should be given to about ten issues. Rather than taking the time to go through each of these items, she thought someone more familiar with marine issues should go through them. Mayor Naugle agreed a licensed boat captain could be helpful.

Commissioner Smith said there was one problem raised by Senator Bell that had started this whole thing and that could be simply addressed. However, it would not be so simple to address the larger issue. Commissioner Smith suggested that in multi-family areas, a second cradle device be allowed in a perpendicular fashion so it would sit down in the water, but only with waterway widths of 400' or more. Mayor Naugle noted that 400' was an extraordinary waterway width so it would limit the areas. Commissioner Katz had no problem with the idea. Commissioner Smith suggested moving forward with this idea now and have a consultant study the remainder of the issues as recommended by the Marine Advisory Board.

Commissioner Hutchinson thought a tour of the waterways would be helpful. Mayor Naugle understood the intent was to prepare an ordinance as suggested by Commissioner Smith and table the rest of the issues for now. Commissioner Katz agreed a consultant's help was necessary, at least in terms of the ten issues she had identified. She also wondered how many single-family homeowners had participated in the process.

Mr. Wren understood the intent was to draft an ordinance that would allow a second lift in multi-family areas along waterways with a width of 400'. Mayor Naugle understood that would allow two lifts on a 100' property. Commissioner Smith agreed that was correct. Commissioner Moore did not care for the idea. Mayor Naugle noted that if the second cradle was perpendicular, it would also limit the size of the boat that could be placed on it because it could not extend more than 20'.

The City Attorney clarified that the suggestion was to allow one lift in the first 100' and an additional lift for anything over 100'. Commissioner Moore was not comfortable with the idea. Mayor Naugle thought the second lift should be allowed if lots were over 101'. He also agreed the Commission needed a tour or good photographs, and he asked staff to provide a map of the multi-family areas adjacent to waterways measuring 400' wide.

**Action:** As discussed.

#### **I-C – 2000 State Legislative Session**

It was the consensus of the Commission to defer this item.

**Action:** Deferred.

#### **I-D – Policy – Speed Humps on Collector Roads**

A discussion was scheduled on the existing policy with respect to the installation of speed humps on collector roads, as requested by Commissioner Hutchinson. Commissioner Hutchinson said she had some concerns about the "de facto" speed limit of 25 MPH that was created in order to install speed humps on a road the County had designated with a speed limit of 30 MPH. Her greatest concern was how the survey was conducted, and she cited Southwest 9<sup>th</sup> Avenue as an example.

Commissioner Hutchinson stated that there were 57 property owners on Southwest 9<sup>th</sup> Avenue, and 34 had responded. There were also two neighborhoods off 9<sup>th</sup> Avenue, and she did not feel 34 constituted a majority. She believed the area between 4<sup>th</sup> and 9<sup>th</sup> Avenues would be inundated with traffic, and a 25 MPH de facto speed limit had been created even though the road was posted with a 30 MPH speed limit. Commissioner Smith noted that had been done on Bayview Drive. Commissioner Hutchinson understood that, but she did not understand why.

At 4:28 P.M., Commissioner Moore left the meeting.

Mayor Naugle believed this had been done on Bayview Drive at the request of the District Commissioner. Commissioner Smith recalled that the speed limit should be 25 MPH, but the County would not agree. Mr. Peter Partington, Engineering Design Manager, stated that some of the collector roads were posted with 30 MPH speed limits, and the County usually declined requests to post at 25 MPH. He noted that most of the properties along 9<sup>th</sup> Avenue were residential and should have the same protection as other residential streets in terms of the speed limit.

Commissioner Hutchinson believed the speed limit on her section of 9<sup>th</sup> Avenue was 25 MPH, Mr. Partington advised the County was not very consistent in this regard, but there were collectors posted at 25 MPH. Commissioner Hutchinson was uncomfortable with a fake 25 MPH speed limit to reach the 85<sup>th</sup> percentile but, if that was going to be done, she felt more people should be surveyed. She felt all the properties within 300' from the collector road should be surveyed. Commissioner Smith pointed out that the properties along the streets were the ones that suffered from the speeding traffic, and the owners of properties on the interior streets did not want speed humps because they were inconvenient. Commissioner Hutchinson felt those properties were affected when traffic was forced off one roadway to others.

At 4:32 P.M., Commissioner Moore returned to the meeting.

Commissioner Hutchinson understood that some people might want 9<sup>th</sup> Avenue to be a residential street, but it was not; it was a collector street. Further, if people did not want to live on a collector street, they should not buy properties in such locations.

Mayor Naugle preferred not to have hard and fast rules with no flexibility because then no speed humps would be approved. However, there were opportunities for input, and the Commission listened to the input before making these types of decisions. Commissioner Hutchinson said she was not suggesting anything had been done incorrectly, but she felt property owners off the collector roads should be surveyed as well as those who owned properties directly on the collector streets. Mayor Naugle noted that recommendations were usually provided by area homeowners associations in these cases, and they represented the neighborhoods.

Mayor Naugle suggested that the approval of speed humps be handled at evening meetings as a matter of policy. It was agreed.

**Action:** As discussed.

At 4:38 P.M., Commissioner Smith left the meeting. He returned at 4:40 P.M.

### **I-E – East Las Olas Boulevard Community Transportation Plan**

A presentation was scheduled by Kimley-Horn & Associates, Inc., the City's Transportation Engineering Consultants, on its conceptual plan for transportation and related improvements on the East Las Olas Boulevard corridor. Mr. Peter Partington, Engineering Design Manager, explained that the subject study had been performed at a cost of \$80,000, and it had taken longer than originally expected due to the need for wide community involvement.

*Mr. Fred Schwartz*, Project Manager for Kimley-Horn & Associates, Inc., presented slides about the Las Olas Community Transportation Plan. He stated that it included a signage program to direct traffic to destinations in ways other than directly through the area, landscaping, median islands, paved intersections, and some intersection modifications. Mr. Schwartz referred to the intersection at 8<sup>th</sup> Avenue and Broward Boulevard. He recommended it be modified to add a turn lane in the northbound direction to double the capacity of the approach with slightly widened lanes on Broward Boulevard.

Mr. Schwartz recommended landscaped medians on East Las Olas Boulevard and East Broward Boulevard, along with a brick paver crosswalk on Broward Boulevard at the school. In addition, intersection improvements were proposed on Broward Boulevard at Southeast 15<sup>th</sup> Avenue and at Las Olas Boulevard and Southeast 15<sup>th</sup> Avenue.

*Mr. Ken Strand*, Nurmi Isles, said there was a parking lot entrance just south of Broward Boulevard, and southbound cars tried to make a left turn to head east into the parking lot, which backed up traffic. Mr. Schwartz said that if it was that close to the intersection, left turns should probably not be allowed. Mayor Naugle believed cars could enter the parking lot from 1<sup>st</sup> Street. Mr. Schwartz agreed that was correct.

Mr. Schwartz proposed raised intersections and paver treatments on Southeast 15<sup>th</sup> Avenue to manage traffic and discourage it from using neighborhood streets. Mr. Strand stated that 15<sup>th</sup> Avenue flooded in heavy rains, and he had spoken to Mr. Kisela about the situation over the past few years. Commissioner Smith wondered if this project would provide opportunities to address the problem. Mr. Kisela believed this would be an opportune time to deal with the issue.

Mr. Schwartz noted that some 24-hour parking would have to be removed in order to provide a median island, but it could be replaced with off-peak parking. Commissioner Moore wondered why the median was suggested if parking would be lost. Mr. Schwartz advised it had been a trade off to enhance aesthetics and pedestrian safety. Commissioner Moore wondered how many spaces would be lost. Mr. Schwartz believed four would be lost from one block on the south side.

*Mr. John Milledge*, representing The Floridian, believed a total of eight spaces would be removed. Commissioner Hutchinson asked how wide the traffic lanes would be, and Mr. Schwartz replied they would be 11' wide. Mr. Partington referred to the parking that would be removed. He believed there would actually be a total of 20 spaces removed. Mr. Schwartz stated that removal of the bike lanes would allow for retention of the parking spaces on the south side. An alternative was to keep the bike lanes and removing the parking width. He advised there was actually only one block of bike lane in the area.

Mayor Naugle inquired about funding. The City Manager stated that a funding source had not yet been identified.

Mr. Partington stated that staff was generally supportive of the plan as presented, but three changes/additions were proposed. The first was extension of the proposed medians on East Broward Boulevard across Northeast/Southeast 12<sup>th</sup> Street and across Southeast 13<sup>th</sup> Street. He noted this had been proposed by the Colee Hammock Civic Association, and the Victoria Park Civic Association supported the change. Mr. Partington added that approval of Broward County would be necessary to implement any of the proposed changes affecting East Broward Boulevard.



Mr. Partington recommended that the proposed medians on East Las Olas Boulevard be extended across Southeast 16<sup>th</sup> Avenue (but not across the 7-11 Store driveway) and across Southeast 17<sup>th</sup> Avenue. He advised that the Colee Hammock Civic Association had suggested this change as well. Mr. Partington suggested that existing parking restrictions on east Broward Boulevard, from Southeast 8<sup>th</sup> Street to Southeast 15<sup>th</sup> Avenue, be changed to prohibit parking at all times. He noted that off-peak street parking was permitted at the current time, but the facility was rarely used.

Commissioner Smith asked if there were any long range plans for parking behind the shops on Las Olas Boulevard. Mr. Partington stated that there were a couple of small City parking lots, but he was not aware of other plans along those lines.

Mr. Milledge was concerned about the loss of on street parking on East Las Olas Boulevard. He hoped alternatives could be considered because the properties on the Boulevard relied on the on-street parking. Mr. Milledge stated that he often parked in the same spaces proposed for removal, and he thought drivers would start driving around in the surrounding neighborhoods looking for parking spaces.

*Mr. Don Metcalf* said he had seen two different displays of the proposed medians on Broward Boulevard. He was deeply concerned about all the business owners on Las Olas Boulevard.

Mr. Strand thought the stacking lane should be extended at 8<sup>th</sup> Avenue and Broward Boulevard as shown on Exhibit 6. He said there was a serious problem in this location, and the stacking lanes to turn southbound on Federal Highway should be extended. Mr. Strand did not know how important the left turn lane into the private driveway was, but there was a real traffic problem here. Mayor Naugle agreed.

*Mr. Buddy Lochrie*, a resident of Colee Hammock and a merchant on Las Olas Boulevard, supported staff's amendments to the Kimley-Horn study. He did, however, want to point out that there was no consistency in the signage in the retail section of Las Olas Boulevard. Mr. Lochrie stated that signs on one side of the road would portray pedestrians, and some signs would be behind trees and awnings. He hoped consideration would be given to better crosswalk signs and placement of signs on the meter machines. Mr. Lochrie provided some examples from the City of Sarasota. He believed the City's revenue could be doubled by allowing parking from 10:00 A.M. to 4:00 P.M. and from 6:00 P.M. to as late as desired. Mayor Naugle did not know how drivers would be able to read the signs from their cars. Mr. Lochrie stated that this was an idea that had worked in other communities.

Commissioner Hutchinson said she had sent information about this idea to Mr. Partington because she thought it was a good one, but she did not believe the parking was enforced. Mr. Lochrie was sure that if it worked in other areas, it would work in Fort Lauderdale as well.

Mayor Naugle hoped that the intersection at Broward Boulevard and Federal Highway could be reduced in the future because it was entirely too wide and very dangerous to cross. Mr. Strand stated that the stacking lane on Broward Boulevard and Federal Highway should be extended because the left lane was often blocked by stacked traffic. Mayor Naugle agreed that should be considered.

*Mr. Marvin Sanders*, a resident of Colee Hammock, stated that County Commissioner Rodstrom supported extending medians even further than recommended by staff although he supported the recommendations. He agreed with an earlier comment about removing a short bike lane to preserve parking because it served no useful purpose at this time. Mr. Sanders did not agree with Mr. Strand's position about stacking lanes, and he noted that a portion of Federal Highway was on the County's Trafficways Plan. He felt consideration should consider removing it and returning ownership to the City.

*Mr. Jon Albee*, President of the Victoria Park Civic Association, commended City staff on an outstanding job of bringing many diverse interests together to advance this plan the Association supported. He felt it was important to provide appropriate landscaping in the medians along Broward Boulevard, and he advocated removal of that roadway from the Broward County Trafficways Plan to allow greater landscaping opportunities. Mr. Albee felt a 6' median would limit these opportunities, but he thought this plan would accommodate many of the diverse interests involved.

*Mr. Jeff Davis*, President of Riviera Isles, generally approved of the proposed plan, and he believed Mr. Strand had pointed out some of the problem areas. He advised that two turn lanes westbound on Broward Boulevard at Southeast 15<sup>th</sup> Avenue might help address problems with trucks causing traffic to stack up. Mr. Davis was also concerned about the medians on Broward Boulevard. He understood the position of the neighborhood associations, but he felt more access points were essential. Mr. Davis felt the overall plan was good, but wider avenues were necessary to address safety issues especially as more and more people went to the beach.

*Mr. Derek Anastasia*, President of Seven Isles, was concerned about the extended medians on Broward Boulevard. He stated there was a problem with residents getting in and out of the Las Olas Isles neighborhood, but he felt the rest of the plan was fantastic. Mayor Naugle suggested a workshop on this subject so the Commission could obtain neighborhood input.

Commissioner Smith stated that the Colee Hammock neighborhood wanted some serenity, and they did not want residents of the Las Olas Isles using the neighborhood as a thoroughfare. On the other hand, they needed easy access out of the Isles. Mayor Naugle thought the extra turn lanes would help deal with some of the traffic, but there was a trade-off. Mr. Schwartz noted that the speed tables were meant to slow traffic so a short-cut route would not be as attractive, and capacity could be added at 15th Avenue. Mayor Naugle pointed out that Isles residents would still be able to cut through heading home.

Mr. Davis felt people would use 15<sup>th</sup> Avenue about 90% of the time, but when there were events on Las Olas Boulevard or a storm was approaching, residents had to find a way out of the neighborhood. He felt the different routes were needed although they were not used that often.

*Mr. Bob Van Fleet*, of the Las Olas Company and Friends of Las Olas, said that the idea of increasing capacity at 15<sup>th</sup> Avenue and closing off 12<sup>th</sup> and 13<sup>th</sup> Avenues had been examined. He believed it would protect the neighborhood and still move traffic as necessary. Mr. Van Fleet pointed out that when events were held, the City required traffic personnel at 15<sup>th</sup> Avenue and Broward Boulevard and at Las Olas Boulevard and Broward Boulevard. Upon questioning by Commissioner Smith, Mr. Van Fleet advised he supported the idea of allowing parking on Las Olas Boulevard during off peak hours.

Commissioner Hutchinson liked the proposed plan, although she was concerned about losing parking spaces from 15<sup>th</sup> Avenue west to Tarpon Drive because she believed that would force cars through the neighborhood looking for parking. Mayor Naugle noted that the western portion of Las Olas Boulevard was not as attractive as the eastern part without the landscaped medians, but parking was very important, too. Commissioner Smith wondered if something could be done at the sides of the road. Commissioner Moore agreed some landscaping treatments on the sidewalks might beautify the area without eliminating parking spaces. Commissioner Smith suggested an arch over the street.

Mr. Partington thought the median could be eliminated at the nursing home location in order to retain about eight parking spaces. He also thought it might be possible to pick up some more metered parking spaces on the side streets.

Mayor Naugle referred to funding. He noted that a creative assessment method had been used for the BridgeSide Square project and the Galt Ocean Mile improvements, and he felt some sort of contribution from residents and business owners would be appropriate in this case. In addition, he expected monies to come from the City, the County and the Florida Department of Transportation.

Commissioner Hutchinson felt Mr. Lochrie's creative recommendations should be considered, and Commissioner Smith favored increasing the amount of on-street, off-peak hour parking. The City Manager stated that staff could "tweak" the concept, examine some more ideas and consider the funding issues.

*Mr. Don Metcalf* stated that there had been a meeting with the Las Olas Advisory Committee last fall before the hurricane. The committee had agreed to a proposal that had not shown medians crossing 12<sup>th</sup> and 13<sup>th</sup> Avenues. However, now the plan showed medians crossing these intersections, and he did not think that would be the right thing to do. Mr. Metcalf did not think the Commission should approve that since it had not been discussed before today. Mr. Partington agreed this represented a change from the original plan, and that was why he had "flagged" this particular issue. He explained that the process had been intended to obtain a broad sample of public opinion, but certain policy decisions would have to be made by the City Commission.

Commissioner Hutchinson believed the idea of extending the medians had come from the Colee Hammock and Victoria Park neighborhoods. She felt input from the neighborhoods was appropriate. Commissioner Smith was sure Mr. Metcalf would agree, but the Las Olas Advisory Committee had not considered the plan with those median extensions. Commissioner Hutchinson understood that, and she wanted to make sure everyone had an opportunity to provide input.

At 5:38 P.M., Commissioner Moore left the meeting.

The City Manager stated that policy direction as to extension of the medians could come from the City Commission now or later, at its discretion. Commissioner Smith hoped plenty of notice of the next discussion in this regard would be provided to residents of the Isles. Commissioner Moore did not know why everyone wanted to go through this entire process knowing that no funding had been identified. Mayor Naugle agreed.

**Action:** As discussed.

At 5:45 P.M., the meeting was recessed for a closed-door session regarding litigation strategy in connection with Arnold P. Abbot for Love Thy Neighbor, Inc. v City of Fort Lauderdale (Case No. 99-003583[05]) and collective bargaining discussions under authority of Section 447.605, Florida Statutes. It was reconvened at 9:45 P.M.

**I-F – 1999 Uniform Crime Report**

**Action:** Deferred to July 6, 2000.

**I-G – Ordinance No. C-99-18/ULDR Section 47-19.5 – Fences, Walls and Hedges**

The Commission agreed to take up this item during the Regular Meeting this evening.

**Action:** Rescheduled for consideration at Regular Meeting.

**I-H – Broward Boulevard Streetscape Improvement Project**

**Action:** Deferred to July 6, 2000.

**I-I – Preliminary Program Development and Environmental Study (PPD&E) –  
Project 15390 – Andrews Avenue, Third Avenue, and Sistrunk Boulevard  
Streetscapes**

**Action:** Deferred to July 6, 2000.

**I-J – High-Speed Broadband Services**

A written report was distributed on the status of competitive broadband cable, telephone and Internet service providers for the City. It was approved without discussion.

**Action:** Approved.

**I-K – Bethune-Cookman College – Annual South Florida Classic Football Weekend Event**

A request was presented from Bethune-Cookman College for the City to assist with the Annual South Florida Classic Football Weekend event at Lockhart Stadium, as requested by Commissioner Moore. It was approved without discussion.

**Action:** Approved.

**II-A – Creation of Subcommittee – Parks, Recreation & Beaches Advisory Board –  
Procedural Guide**

A report was distributed on the creation of a subcommittee by the Parks, Recreation & Beaches Advisory Board for the preparation of a new procedural guide. It was approved without discussion.

**Action:** Approved.

**II-B – City Commission Staff Resources**

A report was distributed on the results of the City Commission staff resources survey conducted of other cities in Florida with similar populations.

**Action:** Deferred to July 6, 2000.

**III-B – Advisory Board Vacancies**

1. Aviation Advisory Board

**Action:** Formal action to be taken at Regular Meeting..

2. Budget Advisory Board

**Action:** Deferred.

3. Civil Service Board

**Action:** Deferred.

4. Community Appearance Board

**Action:** Formal action to be taken at Regular Meeting

5. Education Advisory Board

**Action:** Formal action to be taken at Regular Meeting.

6. Historic Preservation Board

**Action:** Deferred.

7. Marine Advisory Board

**Action:** Deferred.

8. Parks, Recreation & Beaches Advisory Board

**Action:** Deferred.

9. Planning & Zoning Board

**Action:** Formal action to be taken at Regular Meeting.

10. Unsafe Structures & Housing Appeals Board

**Action:** Deferred.

11. Fort Lauderdale Housing Authority

**Action:** Formal action to be taken at Regular Meeting.

**IV – City Commission Reports**

**Action:** Deferred.

**V – City Manager Reports**

**Action:** Deferred.

Meeting adjourned at 9:47 P.M.

NOTE: A MECHANICAL RECORDING HAS BEEN MADE OF THE FOREGOING PROCEEDINGS, OF WHICH THESE MINUTES ARE A PART, AND IS ON FILE IN THE OFFICE OF THE CITY CLERK FOR A PERIOD OF TWO YEARS.